



IFW 2145

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
ATTAULLAH SHEIKH) Examiner: T. Duong
Application No.: 09/660,931) Group Art Unit: 2145
Filed: September 13, 2000)
For: DIRECTORY SERVER)
 TRACKING TOOL : March 28, 2006

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Sir:

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner and his supervisor for the courtesies and thoughtful treatment accorded Applicant's undersigned representative during the March 23, 2006 personal interview. Applicant is submitting this Statement to summarize the discussions and agreements of that interview.

During the interview, independent Claims 1, 9, 12, 19, 29, 32 and 34 were discussed in light of the cited references of Crawley and Fitler. In this regard, in the last Office Action, Claims 1, 9, 12, 19, 29, 32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,321,270 (Crawley), and Claims 2 to 8, 10, 11, 20 to 25, 30, 31, 33 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Crawley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,913 (Fitler). Applicant's undersigned representative discussed the following during the interview.

The invention provides the ability for administrators to track only specific types of changes made to a directory in a directory server. In this regard, the invention established plural multicast groups in which the administrator can register as a member for any one or more of the groups. Each multicast group corresponds to a particular type of change made to a directory of a directory server. For example, one multicast group that is established is known as an ADD multicast group. This multicast group corresponds to ADD changes only such that registered members of this particular multicast group will only receive a multicast message regarding a change to the directory server if the change is one in which an entry in the directory has added. Thus, each time that an entry is added to the directory, only those members who have registered with the ADD group are notified of the change. As will be explained in more detail below, this is in stark contrast to the prior art, in which all nodes included in a network topology receive notification of all changes made to the directory rather than only receiving notification for select types of changes.

The applied art of Crawley is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of establishing plural groups/multicast groups each corresponding to a respective type of change category for a type of change made to a directory server, and when a change is made to a directory of the directory server, submitting change information to each member which belongs to one of the plural groups/multicast groups corresponding to the change category for the type of change made to the directory.

Along the same lines, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest registering as a member of at least one of a plurality of multicast groups each of which corresponds to a respective change category for a type of change made to a directory in a directory server, and the registered member receiving change information submitted to

each member which belongs to the multicast group corresponding to the change category for the type of change made to the directory in the directory server.

As discussed by Applicant, Crawley discloses that, when a change (any change) is made to a network topology, new control information is sent to each node that is to participate in a multicast session. One of the nodes acts as a control point and stores a database that includes a network topology, which includes control information. When the control information is established in the control point node, the control point node multicasts the control information to all of the other nodes in the network topology. Thus, Crawley multicasts the new control information to all nodes, regardless of whether the type of change made to the directory is an add change, a delete change, etc. That is, there is simply no correspondence whatsoever in Crawley between the type of change made and who is to receive the change information. Specifically, Crawley simply fails to provide any disclosure of establishing plural multicast groups, each corresponding to a particular type of change category for a type of change made to the directory, much less that the nodes register as members of the multicast group corresponding to the type of changes that they want to receive. Accordingly, the invention is simply not anticipated by Crawley.

The Examiner and his supervisor agreed that Crawley does not anticipate Claims 1, 9, 12, 19, 29, 32 and 34, and therefore, agreed to withdraw the § 102 rejections.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 111436v1